

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 5, 2004.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9 and 14-22 and objected to claims 5 and 10-13.

The Examiner first rejected claims 14-22 under 35 USC §102 (b) as being anticipated by *Hoffman et al.* '535.

Hoffman describes a dryer with a housing for drying conveyed materials having an entrance 16 and an exit 17 for the conveyed materials. This patent is particularly addressed to the design of temperature sensors 50.

The drying in *Hoffman* is substantially accomplished by using forced air heating provided by combustion in a burner and using two blowers. These components are mentioned but not shown. An intake blower and an inline blower are positioned within or adjacent the housing. One blower draws fresh air into the system to mix with the gas for burning and the second blower moves the heated air into the heating area above the conveyor. The first opening 26 is for the heated air. The forced air is exhausted through openings 29 below the conveyor.

Heater elements 22 are identified but not described.

Hoffman does not describe the compact arrangement of Applicant's invention that incorporates electrical heaters to heat the air.

The Examiner next rejected claims 1-4, and 6-9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Platsch* '788 in view of *Platsch* '318.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to describe an elongated heater housing wherein the flow of air through the housing is substantially perpendicular to the elongation axis of the heater housing. In the preferred embodiment for example, the flow through the undulating channels at any point would have a flow vector that is perpendicular to the elongation direction of the housing. The flow is not axial along the housing. *Platsch* '788 on the other hand does not describe such an arrangement. *Platsch* '318 describes resistive heating elements 60 wherein the air flows axially within the elements along the axis of elongation. Neither reference meets this description in claim 1.

The Examiner next objected to claims 5, and 10-13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated the allowability of these claims if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has complied with these instructions and as such these claims should all now be allowable.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and request issuance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Randall T. Erickson, Reg. No. 33,872

Attorney Docket No.: 6380P0011US
The Law Office of Randall T. Erickson, P.C.
425 W. Wesley St., Suite 1
Wheaton, IL 60187
(630) 665-9404
Customer No. 41528